

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF

TAKANORI NISHIMURA, ET AL. : EXAMINER: BASEHOAR, A.L.

SERIAL NO: 09/575,104

FILED: MAY 19, 2000 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2178

FOR: INFORMATION PROCESSING

METHOD AND APPARATUS

RECEIVED

APR 0 5 2004

RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES

Technology Center 2100

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Election Requirement stated in the Official Action dated March 2, 2004, Applicants in the above-identified patent application provisionally elect Group I, Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-34 and Claims 1, 8 and 15, which both the Applicants and Examiner agree are generic to all species.

The Election Requirement asserts that the application contains claims to distinct inventions. However, MPEP §803 states the following:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be of an overlapping search area.

Application Number /575,104
Reply to Office Action Dated March 2, 2004



Accordingly, Applicants respectfully **traverse** the Election Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

However, if the present Election Requirement is not withdrawn, examination on the merits of the Claims of Group I, and Claims 1, 8 and 15 is believed to be in order, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number 22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 08/03) Bradley D. Lytle Attorney of Record Registration No. 40,073